

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| ERNEST DODD, SR., |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | NO. 3:11-cv-01090 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | JUDGE RICHARDSON |
| |) | |
| CHERRY LINDAMOOD, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

ORDER

On August 18, 2021, Magistrate Judge Frensley issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 77), recommending that the Court (1) deny and dismiss with prejudice Petitioner’s Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 23), (2) deny a certificate of appealability to all claims, and (3) deny Petitioner’s request for an evidentiary hearing as to all claims. Neither party objected to the R&R.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at * 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the R&R and **ADOPTS** and **APPROVES** the R&R (Doc. No. 77). Petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 23) is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED** with prejudice. A certificate of appealability is **DENIED** to all claims. Petitioner's request for an evidentiary hearing is **DENIED** as to all claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE